HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

WRIT PETITION NO.21197 OF 1995

Dated 26-09-2006

Between:

J.Parvathi, daughter of lateRamulu, wifeof Thavudu, 27 years, Unemployee, resident of Purreyavalasa,CheepurupalliMandal, Vizianagaram District.

Petitioner.

And:

1. Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board, represented by its Member Secretary, Hyderabad and another.

Respondents.

ORDER:

The case of the petitioner is that by virtue of the impugned proceedings in Memo No.SE/O/VZM/Adm/A2/F./D.4101/93, dated 16-6-1993, the 2nd respondent rejected her case for appointment in any suitable post on compassionate grounds and the said rejection order is illegal and arbitrary and against the guidelines by the 1st respondent.

It is stated that the petitioner filed an application on 27-5-1985 seeking appointment on compassionate grounds on the ground that her father late Ramulu died on 24-11-1983 while in service and she being his daughter, is entitled for appointment of any suitable post on compassionate grounds.

It is stated by the respondents that having waited for about five to six years, she was ultimately married on 25-2-1989 and consequently, the said marriage would disqualify her seeking appointment on compassionate grounds. It is further stated that the 1st respondent issued memo No.DP/DM.II/809-G1/89-8 dated 7-11-1992 considering the belated applications on the ground of compassionate

appointment. But the claim of the petitioner is rejected on the ground that she was married much earlier to the Memo i.e., in the year 1989.

The point that arises for consideration is:

> Whether the very memo dated 7-11-1992 is applicable to the case of the petitioner or not?

Admittedly, the petitioner was married much earlier to the issuance of Memo in question. If that be so, it cannot be said that the petitioner is still continuing as dependent of the bereaved family even after her marriage. In this view of the matter, the memo in question cannot be said to be applicable to the case on hand. Hence, I do not see any infirmity or illegality or otherwise in rejecting the case of the petitioner by the 2nd respondent and therefore, this writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

Justice V.ESWARAIAH

Dated 26th September, 2006

Dvs

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

WRIT PETITION NO.21197 OF 1995
Dated 26-09-2006